

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/528,000	03/17/2000	Shiri Kadambi	P108339-09065	3384		
32294 75	32294 7590 04/17/2006			EXAMINER		
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.			HOANG, THAI D			
14TH FLOOR			ARTINUT	DA DED MUMADED		
8000 TOWERS	8000 TOWERS CRESCENT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			2616			
			DATE MAIL ED: 04/17/200/	DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/528,000	KADAMBI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thai D. Hoang	2616		

	Thai D. Hoang	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing da	te of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action: or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			coause			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 3.	☐ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-2 and 5</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	It before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:						
	Muyen	HANH NGUYI PRIMARY EXAM	EN INCO			
	0 (/	Chimany Baam	iiven			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Page 6 and 7, Applicants argue the reference fails to teach the step of "determining if the destination port is a monitored port" as recited in claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicants are directed to col. 2, lines 47-50, wherein the reference discloses "[T]he packet meta-data processor portion receives the meta-data packets generated by all of the input port modules and operational status information from all of the output port modules." It indicates that all of the output ports are monitored. In addition, the reference discloses Each input port module, upon receiving a packet from the communication link connected thereto, generates a meta-data packet, the meta-data packet identifying the output port module that is to transmit the packet (col. 2, lines 37-39) and "The operational status information for each output port module includes information that is useful in making a determination for each respective output port module as to whether or not packets that would be transmitted by the respective output port module are to be discarded, or dropped." And "[]f, in processing a meta-data packet, the packet meta-data processor determines that the packet associated with the meta-data packet. On the other hand, if the packet meta-data processor determines that the packet associated with the meta-data packet is not to be dropped, it will enqueue the meta-data packet for the associated output port module." (col. 2, lines 50-67). Since all of the output ports port are monitored and the packets are determined to transmit by the respective output port module or discard; thus, the reference clearly teaches "determining if the destination port is a monitored port" as recited in claim 1.

Page 7, second paragraph, Applicants argue the reference "fails to teach or disclose stripping a header from a packet received from a high performance interconnect link." Examiner respectfully disagrees. The switching nodes in the system disclosed by Schwartz are packet switching nodes. Each transmitting or receiving data packet in a packet switching network comprises a payload portion (data) and a header portion (information of the packet). At each node of the network, the header is stripped and a new header is added to the packet for routing packet. Although Schwartz does not explicitly describe this step, however, this is a general knowledge of one ordinary skill in the art...